

## REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated July 27, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. Applicants appreciate the indication by the Examiner that claims 55-66 and 71-74 include allowable subject matter.

Claims 42-54 are rejected by the Examiner. Claims 55-66 and 71-74 are objected to by the examiner. With this response, claims 42, 55, and 71 are amended. No new material has been added. Claims 1-41 and 75-77 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-77 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 42, 44-48, 50, 52, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP 2001-356353 to Satoshi et al. hereinafter (“Satoshi”); claims 42, 44, 45, 49, 50, 52, 53, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0062787 to Hashizume (hereinafter “Hashizume”); claims 43 and 67-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoshi or Hashizume in view of U.S. Patent 6,129,804 to Gaynes et al. (hereinafter “Gaynes”); and claims 48-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoshi in view of Hashizume and JP09-061829 to Satoru et al. (hereinafter “Satoru”).

The rejection of claims 42, 44-48, 50, 52, and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Satoshi is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that Satoshi does not disclose inherently or explicitly every claimed element.

Claims 42, 44-48, 50, 52, and 53 each recites a method for fabricating a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including “moving the upper chamber unit and the upper stage, thereby positioning the first substrate to align with the second substrate.” Applicants submit that Satoshi does not disclose the identified combination of elements as recited in the claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner cites paragraphs 36 and 37 of Satoshi as teaching “raising the upper chamber and the upper stage to align the first and second substrates.” Paragraph 37 of Satoshi states the following:

Incidentally, alignment reads the alignment mark prepared in vertical each substrates 1a and 1b with the image recognition camera in the inspection hole prepared in the chamber 21 after omitting a graphic display, measures a location by the image processing, makes each stage 4a thru/or 4c of the XYtheta stage T1 move slightly, and performs highly precise alignment.

Applicants submit that T1 is disclosed in FIG. 1 of Satoshi as being the lower stage and that there is no disclosure in Satoshi of “moving the upper chamber unit and the upper stage, thereby positioning the first substrate to align with the second substrate.”

In addition, in the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Examiner cites paragraph 15 of Satoshi as teaching “raising the upper chamber and the upper stage to align the first and second substrates.” Applicants submit that paragraph 15 does not disclose “raising the upper chamber and the upper stage thereby positioning the first substrate to align with the second substrate.”

Applicants submit that no part of Satoshi, including the portions cited by the Examiner discloses inherently or explicitly the above-identified combination of features of claim 42. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit Satoshi does not anticipate claims 42, and claims 44-48, 50, 52, and 53 depending from claim 42.

The rejection of claims 42, 44, 45, 49, 50, 52, 53, and 54 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hashizume is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that Hashizume does not disclose inherently or explicitly every claimed element.

Claims 42, 44, 45, 49, 50, 52, 53, and 54 each recites a method for fabricating a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including “moving the upper chamber unit and the upper stage, thereby positioning the first substrate to align with the second substrate.” Applicants submit that Hashizume does not disclose this combination of elements as recited in the claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner cites paragraphs FIG. 17 and paragraphs 0165-0175 of Hashizume as teaching “raising the upper chamber and the upper stage to align the first and second substrates.” Applicants submit that no portion of Hashizume including the portions cited by the Examiner discloses “moving the upper chamber unit and the upper stage, thereby positioning the first substrate to align with the second substrate” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Hashizume does not anticipate claims 42, 44, 45, 49, 50, 52, 53, and 54.

The rejection of claims 43 and 67-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoshi or Hashizume in view of Gaynes is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit Satoshi, Hashizume, and Gaynes analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

Applicants first note that claims 43 and 67-70 each depends from claim 42 and each includes by reference all of the elements recited in claim 42.

Applicants submit that as discussed above, neither Satoshi nor Hashizume discloses a method for fabricating a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including “moving the upper chamber unit and the upper stage, thereby positioning the first substrate to align with the second substrate” as recited in claim 42. The Examiner cites Gaynes to cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Satoshi or Hashizume. Applicants respectfully submit that Gaynes does not supply the deficiency identified in the teachings of Satoshi or Hashizume. Because Satoshi, Hashizume and Gaynes, considered separately or in any combination do not teach or suggest the above-identified combination of features recited in claim 42, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 42 and claims 43 and 67-70 depending from claim 42 are allowable over the cited references including Satoshi, Hashizume and Gaynes.

The rejection of claims 48-51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoshi in view of Hashizume and Satoru is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit Satoshi, Hashizume, and Satoru analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

Applicants note that claims 48-51 each depends from claim 42 and each includes by reference all of the elements recited in claim 42.

Applicants submit that as discussed above, neither Satoshi nor Hashizume discloses a method for fabricating a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including “moving the upper chamber unit and the upper stage, thereby positioning the first substrate to align with the second substrate” as recited in claim 42. The Examiner cites Satoru as curing deficiencies in the teachings of Satoshi or Hashizume with respect to using a color filter substrate. Applicants do not here reach the Examiner’s conclusion regarding the teachings of Satoru. Applicants submit that Satoru does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Satoshi and Hashizume with respect to “moving the upper chamber unit and the upper stage, thereby positioning the first substrate to align with the second substrate” as recited in claim 42. Because Satoshi, Hashizume and Satoru, considered separately or in any combination do not disclose this feature of the invention recited in claim 42, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 42 and claims 48-51 depending from claim 42, are allowable over the cited references including Satoshi, Hashizume and Satoru.

Claims 55-66 and 71-74 are objected to as depending from rejected base claims but being allowable if amended to independent format reciting all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 55 and 71 have been amended to independent format reciting all of the elements of the base claim 42 and any intervening claims as recommended by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 55 and 71 and claims 56-66 and 72-74 depending from claims 55 and 71 are allowable, and respectfully request that the objection to the claims be withdrawn.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 26, 2006

By Valerie P. Hayes Reg. No. 53,005  
for **Rebecca G. Rudich**  
Registration No. 41,786  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant